



November 21, 1996

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Secretary:

Enclosed within are comments for Advance Television Systems and Their Impact upon the Existing Television Broadcast Service.

Respectfully submitted,

Jay S. Zucker

President

Hispanic Broadcasters of Arizona, Inc.

5401 S. 39th Street

Phoenix, Arizona 85040

.

(602) 470-0507 FAX (602) 470-0810 No. of Copies rec'd O
List ABCDE

Before the Federal Communications Commission Washington, D.C. 20554



In the Matter of)
)
Advance Television Systems	j
and Their Impact upon the) MM Docket No. 87-268
Existing Television Broadcast	j
Service	j

Comments for the Sixth Further Notice Of Proposed Rule Making

Adopted: July 25, 1996 ; Released August 14, 1996

Comment Date: November 22, 1996
Reply Comment Date: November 21, 1996

Comments By: Hispanic Broadcasters of Arizona, Inc.

Background:

Hispanic Broadcasters of Arizona is a locally owned and operated LPTV licensed to service Phoenix, Arizona on UHF TV-64. Since 1990, we have provided our Nation's 14th largest Hispanic Community, full-time Spanish Language programming.

Burdened by several limitations as a LPTV (limited cable carriage and low power), KDRX-LP successfully services *32.4% of Hispanic households and provides Phoenix over with over (25) community sponsored events annually. KDRX is the second Hispanic television service in our market with (24) employees, locally producing news briefs, sporting and cultural events.

The Federal Communications Commission <u>Sixth Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making</u> has numerous undefined areas in relation to LPTV. If the Commission's goal is to provide <u>free-diversified programming</u>; it should also be the commission's goal to protect LPTV. Our Nation hosts approximately (110) Hispanic television stations; <u>55% are LPTV.</u>



Regarding Paragraph #26:

We support the prospect of utilizing channels 60-69 as a permanent position for LPTV for both NTSC and DTV. However, we believe consideration for spectrum auction of such channels prior to the completion of the transitional period for DTV may limit unforeseen needs for the spectrum by broadcasters.

As a UHF TV-64 licensee, we request the Commission to clarify that the compensation for relocating DTV channels in the core spectrum includes <u>all</u> full-power and low-power. Just as the Commission has adopted different levels of protected FM radio licenses; we believe LP to be comparable to a Class "A" (not an FM translator) and full-power to that of Class "C". Adoption of "minimum local origination requirements" should classify stations to their protective status. This will reward broadcasters providing <u>local</u> public service and offer incentives to further enhance existing free-TV services.

Regarding Paragraph #67:

We support the concept that will allow LPTV stations displaced to apply for replacement channels without the potential of being challenged by competing applications.

Regarding Paragraph #68:

We support the concept allowing LPTV stations to operate on channels outside the "core DTV spectrum". In addition, if a station is displaced, that the new user compensates cost to move the station to another channel and loss of investment or business revenue.

Regarding Paragraph #69:

We support the concept of utilizing a full-service digital stations, alternate channels for displaced LPTV. We suggest any station that offers such use be allowed to benefit from the LP's public service efforts. As an example, if the Fox Affiliate carried an LP that aired extensive "Children's Programming", such programming will be credit to the full-service station; or, a LP that is minority programmed, the full-service station should receive Commission values upon license renewal as consideration for carriage.

We further support the prospect of Commission incentives to encourage cable carriage of LPTV; such as relaxing rate structure and other requirements.

Regarding Paragraph #70:

We support setting aside a few frequencies between channels 52 and 59 for displace LPTV or as LPTV DTV.

Regarding Paragraph #71:

We support relaxing the interference rules as an effort to relocate any displaced stations. In addition, we recommend allowing stations an opportunity to show no interference exist, by authorizing STA's (special temporary authority); many times what adopted theory states is not always applicable in the field.

Hispanic Broadcasters of Arizona appreciates the opportunity to file these comments.

Respectfully submitted,

Jay S. Zucker

President